

CONFIDENTIAL

OS REGISTRY

FILE CME-5

x 2498

8 MAR 1983

DCID 1/20

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman, SECOM

FROM:

CIA Member

SUBJECT: Revision of DCID 1/20

REFERENCE: SECOM-D-014

1. This concerns my nonconcurrence with Subject revision, forwarded on 11 January 1983. In the interest of timely publication of a replacement for DCID 1/20, my position is hereby modified to present an addition that will satisfy my concern regarding flexibility of the document. The suggestion:

° In place of the existing paragraph 4b(3) of the January 1983 version substitute the following.

"Waivers for official travel justified by immediate operational need or waivers to avoid redundancy in situations involving experienced and frequent travelers who have received previous security briefings."

° Paragraphs 4b(3) and (4) to be redesignated 4b(4) and (5).

2. With the assumption that the suggested addition will be brought to the attention of the SECOM membership, I concur with the January 1983 version of a revised DCID 1/20.

Attachment

Regraded FOUO when  
separated from attachment.

OS 3 0213/2

Distribution:

Orig - Adse

1 - D/Sec

① - OS Registry

1 - PPG Chrono

OS/P&amp;M/Approved For Release 2005/12/14 : CIA-RDP87B01034R000500190012-8

CONFIDENTIAL

## ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

OS REGISTRY  
FILE *me-5*

SUBJECT: (Optional)

DCID 1/20 Revision

FROM:

PPG/OS

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

9 March 1983

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.  
C/PPG

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Attached is a memorandum expressing Chairman, SECOM's concerns about proposed language for the revision of DCID 1/20.

The Director of Security approved the proposed language on 8 March (See attached memo.)

My own attached memorandum recommends that the Director of Security stay with the language as written, and let the Department of Defense make its own decision about what constitutes "immediate operational need."

"Immediate operational need" protects the equity of all Co S's etc. Do  
Proceed with recommendation that the language remain unchanged.

Agree! We are being into a corner. Unless directed to do otherwise, by D/OS let's hold the line. As far as I am concerned the P&M + P&S line is "no change"